

| | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/569,331 | CHANDRA ET AL |
| | Examiner JYOTHSNA A. VENKAT | Art Unit 1619 |

All Participants:

Status of Application: Non final

(1) JYOTHSNA A. VENKAT. (3) _____.

(2) MILTON HONIG. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 3 June 2010

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

New matter and 112, second paragraph rejection in view of amendment

Claims discussed:

claim 1 and non-elected claims

Prior art documents discussed:

NA

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Examiner informed the attorney that there is no support for the expression "at least two salts" in the specification (new matter rejection) and recitation of broad genus for salts followed by specific species in Markush is unclear and raises issue under 112, second paragraph, however the application is in condition for allowance subjecting to deletion of "at least two salts ... salts comprise" in claim 1 and cancelling non-elected claims drawn to non-statutory subject matter. Attorney authorized the examiner to amend the claims by examiners amendment.

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)